

### **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Support for the claim amendments and additions can be found in the original disclosure. No new matter has been added.

### **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

Claims 1 and 9 are objected to because of the following alleged informalities: Claims 1 and 9 contain the phrase "the computerized readable medium". Applicant has deleted this phrase from claims 1 and 9. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the objections.

### **§ 101 REJECTIONS**

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 101 because claims 1-16 are allegedly directed to the non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, Applicant amended independent claims 1 and 9 as discussed during the interview. Independent claims 1 and 9 now recite: "A computer-readable medium storing on tangible data storage, ~~the computerized readable medium having thereon~~ computer-executable instructions for performing a method on a computing device comprising..." Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the rejections.

### **§ 103 REJECTIONS**

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Bracho et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,021,443) in view of Huang et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,379,970).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9 and 17 without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections.

**Claim 1** recites (emphasis added):

1. (Currently Amended) A computer-readable medium storing on tangible data storage, the computerized readable medium having thereon computer-executable instructions for performing a method on a computing device comprising:

receiving at least one network attachment point change event subscription from at least one network attachment point change event subscriber, network attachment point change events comprising an indication of a change in a network address of a device on a network **from a first network attachment point having a first network attachment point identifier to a second network attachment point having a second network attachment point identifier;**

receiving at least one network attachment point change event publication from at least one network attachment point change event publisher; and

for each network attachment point change event publication matching a network attachment point change event subscription, notifying the network attachment point change event subscriber of the matching published network attachment point change event, **wherein an application layer refers to the second attachment point on the network by using the first network attachment point identifier.**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Bracho in view of Huang. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, Applicant herein amends independent claim 1 to more distinctly recite features of Applicant's claimed subject matter.

For the reasons discussed during the interview, Applicant respectfully submits that Bracho and Gouko, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to teach or suggest the features of this claim emphasized above. Specifically, the cited references do not teach or suggest an ***“application layer refer[ing] to the second attachment point on the network by using the first network attachment point identifier.”*** In fact, during the interview, Applicant understood the Examiner to tentatively agree. Accordingly, as discussed during the interview, this claim is allowable.

**Dependent claims 2-9** depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant respectfully requests the § 103 rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

**Claim 9** recites (emphasis added):

9. (Currently Amended) A computer-readable medium storing computer-executable instructions for performing a method on a computing device comprising:

sending a subscribe message to a virtual connectivity subscribe-notify service subscribing to at least one network attachment point change event published by a remote peer, the at least one network attachment point change event comprising a change in a network address of the remote peer; and

**receiving a notify message from the virtual connectivity subscribe-notify service notifying of a network attachment point change event published by a remote peer.**

In making out a rejection of claim 9 before its amendment, the Office states that this claim is obvious over Bracho in view of Huang. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended claim 9 to include subject matter originally included in claim 12. Applicant asserts that the evidence in the cited references fails to teach or suggest the features of amended independent claim 9. Specifically, that the cited references fail to teach or suggest, **"receiving a notify message from the *virtual connectivity* subscribe-notify service notifying of a network attachment point change event published by a remote peer ..."** (emphasis added). More specifically, the Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not mention anything regarding, a "virtual connectivity," feature. In fact, during the interview, the Applicant understood the Examiner to tentatively agree. Applicant respectfully submits that for at least this reason, this claim stands allowable.

**Dependent claims 10-11 and 13-16** depend from independent claim 9 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant respectfully requests the § 103 rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

**Claim 17** recites (emphasis added):

17. (Currently Amended) A computerized system comprising:

a virtual connectivity subscribe-notify service match module configured to, at least, search a network attachment point change event subscription database for a network attachment point change event subscription that matches a first network attachment point change event, the first network attachment point change event comprising a change in a network address of a device on a network;  
**and**

**a *virtual connectivity* subscribe-notify service publish module configured to, at least, receive a network attachment point change event publish message.**

In making out a rejection of claim 17 before its amendment, the Office states that this claim is obvious over Bracho in view of Huang. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended claim 17 to include subject matter originally included in claim 24. Applicant asserts that the evidence in the cited references fails to teach or suggest the features of amended independent claim 17. Specifically, that the cited references fail to teach or suggest, "**a *virtual connectivity* subscribe-notify service publish module configured to, at least, receive a network attachment point change event publish message.**" More specifically, the Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not mention anything regarding, a "virtual connectivity," feature. In fact, during the interview, the Applicant understood the Examiner to tentatively agree. Applicant respectfully submits that for at least this reason, this claim stands allowable.

**Dependent claims 18-23** depend from independent claim 17 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant respectfully requests the § 103 rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

## CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representatives for Applicant

By: /David K. Sakata/

Dated: 11/25/2008

David K. Sakata ([davids@leehayes.com](mailto:davids@leehayes.com); (509) 944-4716)  
Registration No. 59,959

Robert G. Hartman ([rob@leehayes.com](mailto:rob@leehayes.com); (509) 944-4765)  
Registration No. 58,970

Customer No. **22801**

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979  
[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)